



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/992,054	11/14/2001	Aref Ben Ahmed Jallouli	ESSR:058US/MBW	4850

7590 07/01/2003

FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P.  
A REGISTERED LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP  
SUITE 2400  
600 CONGRESS AVENUE  
AUSTIN, TX 78701

EXAMINER

SERGENT, RABON A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1711

DATE MAILED: 07/01/2003

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/992,054	JALLOULI ET AL. <i>g</i>
	Examiner Rabon Sergeant	Art Unit 1711

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.      2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 17-21 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All   b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

Art Unit: 1711

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - I. Claims 1-16, drawn to a polythiourethane/urea material, classified in class 528, subclass 64.
  - II. Claims 17-21, drawn to a polysulfide, classified in class 568, subclass 57.
2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because:

Inventions of Group II and Group I are related as mutually exclusive species in an intermediate-final product relationship. Distinctness is proven for claims in this relationship if the intermediate product is useful to make other than the final product (MPEP § 806.04(b), 3rd paragraph), and the species are patentably distinct (MPEP § 806.04(h)). In the instant case, the intermediate product is deemed to be useful as a reaction constituent within an ethylenically unsaturated monomer system, and the inventions are deemed patentably distinct since there is nothing on this record to show them to be obvious variants. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions anticipated by the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Art Unit: 1711

3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

4. During a telephone conversation with Mr. Mark Wilson on June 27, 2003 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-16.

Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 17-21 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

5. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

6. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Within line 1 of claim 1, the language, "high index", is subjective terminology. It is unclear what constitutes "high". Furthermore, it is unclear what type of index is being referred

Art Unit: 1711

to. Additionally, “impact resistant” is qualitative terminology; it is unclear what definitive limitation is conveyed by the language.

Within claim 1, the language, “preferably 0.90 to 1.10”, renders the claims indefinite, because it is unclear if or to what extent the preferred language modifies the less preferred language.

Within claim 3, the language, “cycloaliphatic or aromatic”, lacks antecedence.

Within claim 6, there appears to be missing link between the respective sets of bracketed material.

Within claim 7, it is unclear what constitutes a hyperbranched polysulfide.

Within claim 9, it is unclear what “and mixtures thereof” refers to; if the language refers to the structures, then the language should appear before the definition or be clarified in some other way.

Within claim 10, it is unclear what step(2) refers to; claim 1 does not recite steps and is not drawn to a process.

Within line 2 of claim 11, “groups” should not be plural. Furthermore, it is not clear that the language, “the di-, tri-, and tetra alcohols and thiols”, accurately describes the species of the Markush group, because there are no diol or tetra alcohol species. Also, it is not clear that the language adequately reflects the compounds that contain both hydroxyl and thiol groups.

Art Unit: 1711

7. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The examiner has not found a clear description of "hyperbranched polysulfide".

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to R. Sergent at telephone number (703) 308-2982.



**RABON SERGENT**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

R. Sergent  
June 29, 2003